



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,777	07/31/2001	Christopher Uhlik	15685P098	4003
45222	7590	12/14/2006	EXAMINER	
ARRAYCOMM/BLAKELY 12400 WILSHIRE BLVD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/919,777

Applicant(s)

UHLIK ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Ha T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-40, 42, 43, 45-47, 49-51 and 59-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-40, 42-43, 45-47, 49-51, and 59-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **32-40, 42-43, 45-47, 49-51, and 59-63** are presented for examination.
2. Claims 41, 44, 48, 52-58 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 32, 40, 49, and 59 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 32, 40, 49 and 59 include a newly added limitation **"during the session"** which the examiner cannot find any where in the specification that shows or supports this newly added limitation. This limitation is considered as new matter added to the claims which does not support by the specification. The applicant is requested to explain and/or point out where the newly added limitation does support from the specification of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed September 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

6. Applicant argues that Mooney represents a field of art that is not analogous to applicant's invention.

In response to applicant's argument that Mooney is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Mooney's invention does relate to wireless communication environment as recited in paragraph 0156.

Applicant argues that the combination of Verma and Mooney does not teach or suggest the feature of "generating, if the received request is a request for a new session, a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations during the session".

In response to applicant's argument, the examiner asserts that Verma teaches the feature of assigning a session ID to each communication session corresponding to mobile node 20 and session identifier that uniquely identifies the session and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations

Art Unit: 2155

during the session (col. 4, lines 7-31, col. 5, lines 13-25, col. 6, lines 2-32, col. 8, lines 1-47 –*using the call ID value for connection through any basestations/tunnel initiators*).

However, Verma does not explicitly teach the feature of determining whether the received request is a request for a new session or a request to handoff an existing session from a second basestation; and generating, if the received request is a request for a new session, a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session.

Mooney, in the related art, teaches:

determining whether the received request is a request for a new session or a request to handoff an existing session from a second basestation (paragraphs 0139-0141 –*determining whether session ID exist or not in the request*); and

generating, if the received request is a request for a new session and no communication session identifier is included in the request, a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session (figure 14, paragraphs 0139-0142 –*establishing/creating new session ID*) and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations (paragraphs 0082, 0091-0098 –*using unique session ID as a cookie to access one or more message servers i.e., CallPilot server 48*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the feature of generating a unique session ID that can be used to accompany the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations/servers, as disclosed by Mooney, into Verma's system because it would provide an efficient communications system for accessing a plurality of

Art Unit: 2155

messaging servers from single web-base interface by using the assignment of session ID and helping reduce network bandwidth requirements (see Mooney paragraphs 0001, 0008, 0016).

7. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 132, 40, 49 and 59. Claims 33-39, 42-43, 45-47, 50-51, 60-63 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in this office action below.

8. Applicants still have failed to identify specific claim limitations that would define a patentable distinction over cited prior arts. Accordingly, rejections for claims 32-40, 42-43, 45-47, 49-51, and 59-63 are rejected below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 32-33, 40, 43, 49-50 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Verma et al.** (hereinafter Verma) U.S. Patent No. **6,522,880**, in view of **Mooney et al.** (hereinafter Mooney) U.S. Publication No. **2002/0174194**.

11. As to claim 32, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including a method comprising:

receiving a request to establish an end-to-end network communication session between a subscriber unit in a wireless communication system and a data network access server through a first basestation (col. 3, line 30-col. 4, line 31, col. 7, line 60-col. 8, line 8 *—establishing connection communication between mobile node 20 and tunnel endpoint 250 via tunnel initiators 230, 240, figure 4*);

Verma teaches the feature of assigning a session ID to each communication session corresponding to mobile node 20 and session identifier that uniquely identifies the session and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations during the session (col. 4, lines 7-31, col. 5, lines 13-25, col. 6, lines 2-32, col. 8, lines 1-47 *—using the call ID value for connection through any basestations/tunnel initiators*).

However, Verma does not explicitly teach the feature of determining whether the received request is a request for a new session or a request to handoff an existing session from a second basestation; and generating, if the received request is a request for a new session, a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session.

Mooney, in the related art, teaches:

determining whether the received request is a request for a new session or a request to handoff an existing session from a second basestation (paragraphs 0139-0141 *—determining whether session ID exist or not in the request*); and

generating, if the received request is a request for a new session and no communication session identifier is included in the request, a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session (figure 14, paragraphs 0139-0142 – *establishing/creating new session ID*) and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations (paragraphs 0082, 0091-0098 -*using unique session ID as a cookie to access one or more message servers i.e., CallPilot server 48*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the feature of generating a unique session ID that can be used to accompany the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations/servers, as disclosed by Mooney, into Verma's system because it would provide an efficient communications system for accessing a plurality of messaging servers from single web-base interface by using the assignment of session ID and helping reduce network bandwidth requirements (see Mooney paragraphs 0001, 0008, 0016).

12. As to claim 33, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including a method claim 32, further comprising:

authenticating, if the request is a request to handoff an existing session, an existing communication session identifier received with the request (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 16, col. 9, lines 22-53).

13. As to claim 40, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including an apparatus comprising:

a network interface to receive a request for an end-to-end network communication session between a wireless communication system subscriber unit and the apparatus through a first basestation (col. 3, line 30-col. 4, line 31, col. 7, line 60-col. 8, line 8 –*establishing connection communication between mobile node 20 and tunnel endpoint 250 via tunnel initiators 230, 240, figure 4*);

Verma teaches the feature of assigning a session ID to each communication session corresponding to mobile node 20 and session identifier that uniquely identifies the session and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations during the session (col. 4, lines 7-31, col. 5, lines 13-25, col. 6, lines 2-32, col. 8, lines 1-47 –*using the call ID value for connection through any basestations/roaming to foreign agent*).

However, Verma does not explicitly teach the feature of determining whether the request is a request for a new session or not and generating a session ID if no communication session ID is included in the request.

Mooney, in the related art, teaches:

a communications agent to determine whether the received request is a request for a new session or a request to handoff an existing session from a second basestation (paragraphs 0139-0141 –*determining whether the session ID exist or not in the request*); and

a session identification generator, invoked by the communications agent if the received request is a request for a new session, to generate a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session (figure 14, paragraphs 0139-0142 – *establishing/creating new session ID*) and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations paragraphs 0082, 0091-0098 -*using unique session ID as a cookie to access one or more message servers i.e., CallPilot server 48*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the feature of generating a unique session ID that can be used to accompany the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations/servers, as disclosed by Mooney, into Verma's system because it would provide an efficient communications system for accessing a plurality of messaging servers from single web-base interface by using the assignment of session ID and helping reduce network bandwidth requirements (see Mooney paragraphs 0001, 0008, 0016).

14. As to claim 43, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including the apparatus of claim 40, wherein the communications agent analyzes attribute value pair(s) (AVP) of a received incoming call request control command to identify a callType AVP to determine whether an incoming call request indicates a new communication session or a handoff of an existing communication session (col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-61).

15. As to claim 49, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including an article of manufacture comprising: a machine accessible storage medium having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions which, when executed by an accessing computing device, cause an electronic system to:

receive a request to establish an end-to-end network communication session between a subscriber unit in a wireless communication system and a data network access server through a first basestation (col. 3, line 30-col. 4, line 31, col. 7, line 60-col. 8, line 8 –*establishing connection communication between mobile node 20 and tunnel endpoint 250 via tunnel initiators 230, 240, figure 4*);

Verma teaches the feature of assigning a session ID to each communication session corresponding to mobile node 20 and session identifier that uniquely identifies the session and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations during the session (col. 4, lines 7-31, col. 5, lines 13-25, col. 6, lines 2-32, col. 8, lines 1-47 –*using the call ID value for connection through any basestations/roaming to foreign agent*).

However, Verma does not explicitly teach the feature of determining whether the request includes a session ID or not and generating a new session ID if the session ID is not included in the request and a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session.

Mooney, in the related art, teaches:

determine whether the received request is a request for a new session or a request to handoff an existing session from a second basestation (paragraphs 0139-0141 –*determining whether the session ID exist or not in the request*); and

generate, if the received request is a request for a new session, a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the session (figure 14, paragraphs 0139-0142 –*establishing/creating new session ID*) and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations figure 14, paragraphs 0139-0142 –*establishing/creating new session ID*) and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations paragraphs 0082, 0091-0098 -*using unique session ID as a cookie to access one or more message servers i.e., CallPilot server 48*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the feature of generating a unique session ID that can be used to accompany the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations/servers, as disclosed by Mooney, into Verma's system because it would provide an efficient communications system for accessing a plurality of messaging servers from single web-base interface by using the assignment of session ID and helping reduce network bandwidth requirements (see Mooney paragraphs 0001, 0008, 0016).

16. As to claim 50, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including the article of manufacture of claim 49 further to authenticate, if the request is a request to

Art Unit: 2155

handoff an existing session, an existing and valid communication session identifier received with the request (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 16, col. 9, lines 22-53).

17. As to claim 59, Verma teach the invention as claimed, including a wireless subscriber unit, comprising:

a requester to send a request to establish an end-to-end network communication session between the subscriber unit and a data network access server through a first basestation (col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 23);

a receiver coupled to the requester to receive a communication session identifier that uniquely identifies the end-to-end network communication session and accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations during the session (col. 4, lines 8-31, col. 5, lines 13-25, col. 6, lines 2-32, col. 8, lines 1-47 –using the call ID value for connection through any basestations/tunnel initiators).

However, Verma does not explicitly teach a memory coupled to the receiver to store the communication session identifier.

Mooney teaches a memory coupled to the receiver to store the communication session identifier (paragraphs 0098, 0140-0142, 0162).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the feature of store the communication session identifier at the subscriber unit, as disclosed by Mooney, into Verma's system because it would provide an efficient communications system for accessing a plurality of messaging servers from single web-base interface by using the assignment of session

Art Unit: 2155

ID and helping reduce network bandwidth requirements (see Mooney paragraphs 0001, 0008, 0016).

18. Claims 34, 44 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Verma et al.** (hereinafter Verma) U.S. Patent No. **6,522,880**, and **Mooney et al.** (hereinafter Mooney) U.S. Publication No. **2002/0174194**, further in view of **Igarashi et al.** (hereinafter Igarashi) U.S. Publication No. **2001/0053694**.

19. As to claim 34, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including a method claim 32, wherein determining comprises:

analyzing attribute-value pair(s) (AVP) of the received request to identify a callType AVP (col. 5, lines 13-34).

However, Verma and Mooney system does not explicitly teach the feature of identifying the received request as a request for a new communication session if the callType AVP is absent from the incoming call request, or if an identified callType AVP associated with the received request denotes a new call.

Igarashi, in the related art, teaches identifying the received request as a request for a new communication session if the callType AVP is absent from the incoming call request, or if an identified callType AVP associated with the received request denotes a new call (paragraphs 0104, 0193-0199, 0290-0292). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney and Igarashi to include the step of

Art Unit: 2155

determining AVP of the received incoming call whether the request communication session is a new call or not because it would have an efficient communication system that allow to keep track, detect and authorize the call request.

20. As to claim 44, Verma and Mooney system does not explicitly teach the feature of wherein the communications agent invokes the session identification generator if the callType AVP denotes a new call, or if the callType AVP is not identified within the incoming call request control command.

Igarashi, in the related art, teaches wherein the communications agent invokes the session identification generator if the callType AVP denotes a new call, or if the callType AVP is not identified within the incoming call request control command (paragraphs 0104, 0193-0199, 0290-0292).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, and Igarashi to include the step of determining AVP of the received incoming call whether the request communication session is a new call or not because it would have an efficient communication system that allow to keep track, detect and authorize the call request.

21. As to claim 60, Verma and Mooney system does not explicitly teach wherein the request includes a callType AVP to denote a new call.

Igarashi, in the related art, teaches the request includes a callType AVP to denote a new call (paragraphs 0104, 0193-0199, 0290-0292). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney and Igarashi to include the request includes a callType AVP to denote a new call because it would have an efficient communication system that allow to keep track, detect and authorize the call request.

22. Claims 35-39 and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Verma, Mooney, and Maggenti et al.** (hereinafter Maggenti) U.S. Pub. No. **2003/0012149**, further in view of **Murphy, Jr. et al.** (hereinafter Murphy, Jr.) U.S. Patent No. **6,006,266**.

23. As to claim 35, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including a method claim 32, wherein generating the communication session identifier comprises: composing a deterministic element of the communication session identifier (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 29, col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-53).

However, Verma does not explicitly teach the feature of composing a random element of the communication session identifier and employing a mathematical function to generate the communication session identifier using the deterministic element and the random element.

Maggenti, in the related art, teaches composing a random element of the communication session identifier (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456).

Murphy, Jr., in the related art, teaches employing a mathematical function to generate the communication session identifier using the deterministic element and the random element (col. 9, lines 22-col. 10, lines 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, Maggenti and Murphy, Jr. to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

24. As to claim 36, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including a method claim 35, wherein the deterministic element is comprised of one or more of an electronic serial number (ESN) of the accessing subscriber unit, a media access control (MAC) address of the subscriber unit, and/or a telephone number associated with the subscriber unit (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 29, col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-53).

25. As to claim 37, Verma-Mooney system does not explicitly teach wherein the random element is comprised of one or more of a pseudo-random number, and/or a true random number generated from radio frequency (RF) energy of thermal noise associated with the communication session.

However, Maggenti, in the related art, teaches wherein the random element is comprised of one or more of a pseudo-random number, and/or a true random number

generated from radio frequency (RF) energy of thermal noise associated with the communication session (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456, 0461-0473).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, Maggenti and Murphy, Jr. to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

26. As to claim 38, Murphy, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, including a method claim 35, wherein the mathematical function employed concatenates the deterministic element and the random element to generate the communication session identifier (col. 9, lines 22-col. 10, lines 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, Maggenti and Murphy, Jr. to employed concatenates the deterministic element and the random element to generate the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

27. As to claim 39, Murphy, Jr. teaches the invention as claimed, including a method claim 35, wherein the mathematical function employed generates a hash of the deterministic element and the random element to generate the communication session identifier (col. 9, lines 22-col. 10, lines 64, coll. 12, lines 58-col. 13, lines 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, Maggenti and Murphy, Jr. to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

As to claim 61, Verma does not explicitly teach wherein the communication session identifier received by the receiver includes a deterministic element and a random element.

Maggenti, in the related art, teaches composing a random element of the communication session identifier (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456).

Murphy, Jr., in the related art, teaches the communication session identifier received by the receiver includes a deterministic element and a random element (col. 9, lines 22-col. 10, lines 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, Maggenti and Murphy, Jr. to include the communication session identifier received by the receiver includes a deterministic element and a random element because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

28. As to claim 62, Verma teaches wherein the deterministic element is comprised of one or more of an electronic serial number (ESN) of the accessing

Art Unit: 2155

subscriber unit, a media access control (MAC) address of the subscriber unit, and/or a telephone number associated with the subscriber unit (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 29, col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-53).

29. As to claim 63, Verma-Mooney system does not explicitly teach wherein the random element is comprised of one or more of a pseudo-random number, and/or a true random number generated from radio frequency (RF) energy of thermal noise associated with the communication session.

However, Maggenti, in the related art, teaches wherein the random element is comprised of one or more of a pseudo-random number, and/or a true random number generated from radio frequency (RF) energy of thermal noise associated with the communication session (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456, 0461-0473).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney, Maggenti and Murphy, Jr. to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

30. Claims 42, 45-47, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Verma et al.** (hereinafter Verma) U.S. Patent No. **6,522,880**, and **Mooney et al.** (hereinafter Mooney) U.S. Publication No. **2002/0174194**, further in view of **Maggenti et al.** (hereinafter Maggenti) U.S. Pub. No. **2003/0012149**.

31. As to claim 42, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including the apparatus of claim 40, wherein the communication session identifier generated by the session identification generator comprises at least a deterministic element (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 29, col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-53).

However, Verma, Mooney system does not explicitly teach the communication session identifier generated by the session identification generator comprises at least a random element.

Maggenti, in the related art, teaches the communication session identifier generated by the session identification generator comprises at least a random element (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney and Maggenti to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide a level of secure needed for group communication services over conventional wireless group communications system thus providing the ability to quickly and inexpensively implement group services in a wireless communication services (see Maggenti paragraphs 0016, 0455).

32. As to claim 45, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the session identification generator composes the deterministic element using one or more of an electronic serial number (ESN) of the

Art Unit: 2155

accessing subscriber unit, a media access control (MAC) address of the subscriber unit, and/or a telephone number of the subscriber unit (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 29, col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-53).

33. As to claim 46, Verma and Mooney system does not explicitly teach wherein the session identification generator composes the random element of the session identifier utilizing a pseudo-random number generator.

Maggenti teaches wherein the session identification generator composes the random element of the session identifier utilizing a pseudo-random number generator (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456, 0461-0473).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney and Maggenti to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

34. As to claim 47, Verma and Mooney system does not explicitly teach wherein the session identification generator composes the random element of the session identifier by generating a true random number from radio frequency (RF) thermal noise.

Art Unit: 2155

Maggenti teaches wherein the session identification generator composes the random element of the session identifier by generating a true random number from radio frequency (RF) thermal noise (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456, 0461-0473).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney and Maggenti to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide secure communication system between subscriber unit and server.

35. As to claim 51, Verma teaches the invention as claimed, including the article of manufacture of claim 49, wherein the communication session identifier comprises a deterministic element (col. 2, line 55-col. 3, line 29, col. 5, lines 13-34, col. 9, lines 30-53).

However, Verma, Mooney system does not explicitly teach wherein the communication session identifier comprises a random element.

Maggenti, in the related art, teaches wherein the communication session identifier comprises a random element (paragraphs 0272-0273, 0454-0456).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Verma, Mooney and Maggenti to include the step of composing a random element of the communication session identifier because it would provide a level of secure needed for group communication services over conventional wireless group communications system thus

Art Unit: 2155

providing the ability to quickly and inexpensively implement group services in a wireless communication services (see Maggenti paragraphs 0016, 0455).

Conclusion

36. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Ha Nguyen, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3989. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Najjar Saleh, can be reached at (571) 272-4006.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Thu Ha Nguyen

Primary Examiner

December 08, 2006